

### REMARKS


According to the Examiner Claims 1 – 24 are presently pending. In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 – 8 and 15 – 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Budnik *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,016,204). Claims 1, 9 – 15, 23 and 24 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over Claims 1 – 3 and 5 – 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,687,634, the parent of the present application.

Clearly the Examiner has not considered the Preliminary Amendment filed December 1, 2003 in connection with the present application. In the event that the Office did not receive this document, a copy is enclosed for the convenience of the Examiner along with a copy of the Request for Continuing Application, which references the Preliminary Amendment and bears a Certificate of Mailing. Also enclosed is a copy of a postcard showing receipt by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office of the Preliminary Amendment. In addition, Applicant has enclosed a terminal disclaimer with respect to U.S. Patent No. 6,687,634 to overcome the double patenting rejection of Claims 1 and 15.

For the reasons set forth in the Preliminary Amendment, reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue are therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
Michael Jonas Borg

By



William J. Benman  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 29,014

Benman, Brown & Williams  
2049 Century Park East  
Suite 2740  
Los Angeles, CA 90067

310-553-2400  
310-553-2675 (fax)